

In the Drawings

1 Figure 1A and Figure 1B have been amended by including
2 the designation - -PRIOR ART- - on each drawing and a
3 corrected sheet transmitted herewith have been labeled - -
4 Replacement Sheet- -.

5

6 In Figure 5B, the designation of block 5 has been
7 changed from "EVENT SIGNAL" to - -NO EVENT SIGNAL- -. This
8 change was made to bring Fig. 5B into conformity with the
9 Specification and no new matter was entered thereby.

In the Drawings

1 Figure 1A and Figure 1B have been amended by including
2 the designation - -PRIOR ART- - on each drawing and a
3 corrected sheet transmitted herewith have been labeled - -
4 Replacement Sheet- -.

5
6 In Figure 5B, the designation of block 5 has been
7 changed from "EVENT SIGNAL" to - -NO EVENT SIGNAL- - and a
8 corrected sheet transmitted herewith has been labeled - -
9 Replacement Sheet - -. This change was made to bring Fig.
10 5B into conformity with the Specification and no new matter
11 was entered thereby.

REMARKS

1 Claims 1-20 have been presented for examination in the
2 above-identified U.S. Patent Application.

3
4 Claims 1-20 have been rejected in the Office Action
5 dated September 13, 2006.

6
7 Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10 and 12-20 have been amended by
8 this Amendment A

9
10 Claims 1-20 are still in the application and
11 reconsideration of the Application is hereby respectfully
12 requested.

13
14 Referring to Paragraph 1 of the Office Action,
15 replacement drawing for Fig. 1A and 1B have been
16 transmitted herewith having Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B designated
17 as - -PRIOR ART- -.

18
19 In addition, a replacement drawing is herewith
20 transmitted in which Block 5 the Fig. 5B has been
21 designated as - -NO EVENT SIGNAL- -instead of the previous
22 designation "EVENT SIGNAL".

23
24 Referring to Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claim
25 12 has been rejected under 35 U. S.C. 101 as being directed
26 to non-statutory subject matter. By this Amendment A,
27 Claim 12 has been amended and is believed to address the

1 comments of Examiner. The results of the comparison
2 generate an output (event) signal. The event signal can be
3 used in a variety of ways, such as to trigger activity in
4 the target processor. Therefore, rejection of Claim 12
5 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been answered by amendment and
6 explanation.

7
8 Referring to Paragraphs 3-23, Claim2 1-20 have been
9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
10 U.S. Publication No. 2002/0184477 issued in the name of
11 Swaine et al (hereinafter referred to as Swaine). The
12 Swaine reference describes apparatus for providing an
13 output signal similar to the event signal of the present
14 invention. The Swaine reference describes the production
15 of the output signal when a context identifier is present
16 and when an address is the same as a predetermined address
17 (cf Paragraph **[0018]**). In contradistinction, the invention
18 of the Application includes a comparator unit that provides
19 a positive comparison not only for identical addresses, but
20 for addresses having one of a plurality of selected
21 characteristics. Among the plurality of selected
22 characteristics is, for example, the touching requirement.
23 This requirement is not only discussed in the
24 Specification, but Figs. 5A, 5B and 5C illustrate the
25 requirement. Applicant is unable to find any indication of
26 this type of non-identity requirement in the Swaine
27 reference.

28
29 Consequently, Claims 1, 6, 12, and 17, the independent
30 Claims in the Application, have been amended to include the

1 limitation that the comparators can determine if one of a
2 plurality of selected characteristics are present. The
3 presence of one of these selected characteristics can, when
4 appropriate control signals are applied to the comparator,
5 result in an output signal. In the Swaine reference, not
6 only are the additional selected characteristics of the
7 address signal group not present, but the control signals
8 there for are not necessary and not discussed or included
9 in the claims.

10
11 Therefore, in view of the differences between the
12 present Claims, as amended and the Swaine reference,
13 rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Swaine
14 is respectfully traversed.

15
16 Consequently, it is believed that Claims 1-20 are now
17 in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

1 In view of the foregoing discussion and the foregoing
2 amendments, it is believed that Claims 1-20 are now in
3 condition for allowance and allowance of Claims 1-20 is
4 respectfully requested. Applicant(s) hereby respectfully
5 requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this
6 Application.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Holloway
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 26,182

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(281) 274-4064
Dated: December 13, 2006